

REMARKS

Claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 15, 19-24, 33 and 34 are amended. Claims 18 and 25-32 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Support for the amendment to independent claim 1 may be found at least at original claims 18, 25 and 32. Claims 15, 19-24, 33 and 34 are amended for clarity and to address informalities. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

The Office Action objects to claims 16, 28 and 34 for informalities. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 28 is canceled, thus the rejection of claim 28 is moot. Claim 16 is amended responsive to the rejection. With respect to claim 34, Applicants submit that the term is clear. The term "excepting" is not a typographical error and pertains to the presently claimed "forming."

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects claims 18, 23 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 and 30 have been canceled, thus the rejection of claims 18 and 30 is moot. Claim 23 has been amended responsive to the rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 15-24 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,468,306 (Paul); rejects claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Paul; and rejects

claims 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Paul in view of JP 09-276303 (Hoya). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

By this amendment, the subject matter of claims 25 and 32 has been incorporated into independent claim 15. The Office Action admits that Paul fails to teach the features recited in claims 25 and 32. Thus, the presently claimed features cannot be disclosed by the teachings of Paul. With respect to claims 25 and 32, the Office Action admits that Paul fails to teach haptics formed of harder PMMA and the lens formed of softer acrylics. The Office Action relies on Hoya to cure these deficiencies.

Applicants respectfully submit that Paul and Hoya, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach and would not have rendered obvious "a stepped part provided in a boundary between the optic portion and the support portion of the posterior surface of the optic portion so as to be arranged in such a way that the surface of a part shifting to a region of the support portion from the region of the optic portion suddenly shifts in a direction of the anterior surface of the optic portion," (emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 1.

Conventionally, in a single-piece type intraocular lens, a raw material is processed such that an optical portion and a support portion are coupled to each other, forming the single-piece type intraocular lens. Thus, it is not required to provide a step between the optic portion and the support portion. In the present application, the step is formed all around an edge part located in a region of the optic portion, namely the step is provided in a boundary between the optical portion and the support portion.

In addition, the optic portion and an edge part located in a region of the optic portion of the stepped part are made of a soft acrylic material, thereby closely bringing it into contact with a lens capsule, helping to prevent lens epithelial cells from migrating to the posterior portion of the optic portion. Further, the support portion is made of PMMA which has excellent shape memorizing properties, thereby being excellent in stability of the intraocular

lens and increasing productivity of processing for the single-piece type intraocular lens (reference to Fig. 5, processing is easily performed when a periphery of the raw material is PMMA).

Paul discloses that a peripheral land is provided in a front and/or back surface of an IOL, so as to inhibit growing of epithelial cells of an eye and reducing glare in the eye. Paul also discloses, at col. 14, lines 10-21, a general method of processing IOL such as injection molding, compression molding, lathing and milling. Further, in col. 5, lines 41-67, Paul discloses PMMA, silicone polymeric materials, acrylic polymeric materials and hydrogel-forming polymeric materials.

Hoya discloses a general intraocular lens capable of bending itself, having an optic portion and a support portion. However, each reference does not disclose that the steps are formed all around an edge part located in a region of the optic portion.

Further, the presently claimed "stepped part" is provided in a boundary between the optical portion and the support portion. Normally, in the single-piece intraocular lens, a step is not provided between the optical portion and the support portion, as in Paul and Hoya, which do not disclose an intraocular lens formed as a single-piece type and a method of processing the intraocular lens, as presently claimed. In the present claims, a single-piece type intraocular lens has a step is formed all around an edge part located in a region of the optic portion, namely the steps are also provided in a boundary between the optical portion and the support portion. As described above, Paul does not disclose that a step is formed all around an edge part located in a region of the optic portion. Further, Hoya fails to cure the deficiencies of Paul.

Thus, the applied references fail to teach and would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of independent claim 15.

Claims 16, 17, 19-24, 33 and 34 depend from claim 15. Because the applied references fail to anticipate or render obvious the features recited in independent claim 15, dependent claims 16, 17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 15 is patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Smith Sirisakorn
Registration No. 65,056

JAO:SZS/hms

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 21, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
